5

10

15

20

25

30

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on July 1, 2003 with claims 1 through 26. Claims 1 through 26 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 17 and 26 are proposed to be amended herein. Claims 27 and 28 are proposed to be added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Orwick et al., (United States Patent Number 6,201,856). Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Contractor et al. (United States Patent Number 6,427,001).

## Section 112 Rejection

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner objected to the use of the word "intended" in the phrase "intended recipient" in the independent claims. Claims 1, 17 and 26 have been amended herein, to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection.

## Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Orwick et al. and under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Contractor et al.

Each independent claim has been amended to emphasize that the notification message includes information *about a response that was dispatched* for said received communication. The amendment is supported, for example, at page 7, lines 15-20.

For both Orwick et al. and Contractor et al., however, the notification is *independent* of the dispatch. Orwick et al. and Contractor et al. do not have information beyond the subscriber telephone number, and time/date of the call. (Orwick, col. 5, lines 5-10). In Orwick et al., see, for example, col. 3, lines 20- 27 (noting templates used for notification) and col. 4, lines 18-28 (noting information is sent to SCN for notification *before* completing call to 911). In Contractor et al., see, for example, col. 4, lines 14-16 (system does not intrude on 911 infrastructure).

Generally, Orwick et al. and Contractor et al. report to a third party that an emergency call has occurred. So, for example, these systems would send a notification that a 911 call was placed

5 from a particular house. But, the notification does not contain any additional information about what happened when 911 "dispatched" a response to that call.

Orwick et al. and Contractor et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that the notification message includes information about a response that was dispatched for said received communication, as required by each independent claim.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection.

## Dependent Claims 2-16 and 18-25

Dependent claims 2-16 and 18-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rogers. Claims 2-16 and 18-25 are dependent on claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Rogers because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 17, and 26 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

New claims 27 and 28 are proposed to be added, to give Applicants the protection to which they are entitled. No new matter is added. Support for these claims can be found, for example, at page 2, line 30, to page 3, line 3.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

25

20

10

15

Date: November 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Mason

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Kleid. Noon

Reg. No. 36,597

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP 1300 Post Road, Suite 205 Fairfield, CT 06824

(203) 255-6560

35

30